## REMARKS

A revised Power of Attorney has been submitted herewith in order to overcome the Examiner's objections to the previously filed terminal disclaimer. Entry of the attached terminal disclaimer is respectfully requested.

## **Double Patenting Rejections**

Claims 1-4 and 6-11 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claim 21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,649,262B2.

The rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-11 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting is obviated by the filing of an appropriate terminal disclaimer. Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.130(b), a terminal disclaimer pursuant to 37 CFR 1.321(c) with respect to U.S. Patent Application No. 10/664,342 is filed herewith. The present application and U.S. Patent No. 6,649,262 are commonly owned by Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc. Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 6, and 12 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1, 18, and 39 of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/900,746.

The rejection of claims 1, 6, and 12 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting is obviated by the filing of an appropriate terminal disclaimer. Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.130(b), a terminal disclaimer pursuant to 37 CFR 1.321(c) with respect to U.S. Patent Application No. 10/664,342 is filed herewith. The present application and copending Application No. 09/900,746 are commonly owned by Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc. Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

## Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lang et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,429,261. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Lang does not teach or disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. Specifically, Lang does not teach a method of winding of a wet web, wherein the variability of the salt throughout the wet roll is less than about 20%. Presumably,

the Examiner asserts that whenever a web of material is sprayed with a binder composition, its roll will have uniform variability of the salt throughout the roll. This is not always the case. In particular, Lang states that the "binder composition may be distributed through the entire fibrous substrate or it may be distributed within a multiplicity of small closely spaced areas." Lang, col. 18, II.63-65. Although Lang does state that it would be desirable to have uniform distribution, it in no way provides a method that would necessarily provide for a uniform distribution of the binder composition within the roll.

For example, in some applications, a web of material may be cut when it is dry and the wetting composition will then be applied afterwards. In this example, the end of the web may be formed into a cigarette, beginning the roll, before it is wetted. The rest of the web is then wetted and wound around the cigarette for form the roll. Therefore, the cigarette would not contain wetting solution and the roll would not have a uniform distribution of wetting solution throughout the roll. Therefore, it does not necessarily follow that all rolls sprayed with wetting solution would have uniform distribution throughout.

Applicants claim first applying a wetting solution to a web to produce a wet web and winding the <u>wet</u> web into a wet roll. Lang does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

## **SUMMARY**

Pending Claims 1-21 are patentable. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner grant early allowance of this application. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorneys for the Applicant via telephone if such communication would expedite this application.

Respectfully submitted.

Marola Heller

Amanda M. Miller

Registration No. 52,469 Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. BOX 10395 CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610 (312) 321-4200